CHURCH MUSIC.

A LECTURE,

BY

THE REV. J. MURRAY WILKINS, M.A.,

RECTOR OF SOUTHWELL, NOTTS, AND RURAL DEAN.

First American Edition, with Notes.

BALTIMORE:
JOSEPH ROBINSON.
1861.

CHURCH MUSIC.

A LECTURE,

BY

THE REV. J. MURRAY WILKINS, M.A.,

RECTOR OF SOUTHWELL, NOTTS, AND RURAL DEAN.

First American Edition, with Notes.

BALTIMORE:
JOSEPH ROBINSON.
1861.

PREFACE.

The following Lecture was compiled from (besides other authorities) Hawkin's History of Music; Palmer's Origines Liturgicæ; Jebb and Latrobe on the Choral Service; The Parish Choir; Apology for the Cathedral Service; The Ecclesiologist, Vols. VII., VIII., IX., and various lectures and papers by Jebb, Helmore, Druitt, Hullah, Sir H. Dryden, Spark, Childs Clarke, Wright, Campbell, Fetis, &c. &c.

The Lecture was originally written for, and read before, the Literary Society in my own parish; it was afterward delivered, by request, at the Mechanics' Hall, Nottingham; and at the Town Halls of Newark, and Retford.

It is now published,—also by request.

Southwell, *Easter*, 1856.

A

LECTURE ON CHURCH MUSIC.

The last time I had the honour of appearing before you as a Lecturer, I took the liberty of expressing my opinion as to the value of Mechanics Institutes and Literary Societies like yours, when regarded in an Educational point of view.* I shall also this evening commence by a few words on the practice, now become so general, of delivering Lectures at such Institutions.

Now, when any one who has much studied any particular subject, or from education, ability, or experience, is rightly regarded as an authority on any particular subject, delivers as it were the concentrated essence of his knowledge or experience in the form of a lecture, such lecture is of course in itself valuable. But I think that there are only two classes of hearers to whom such a lecture is likely to prove of real or lasting value, viz., 1. Those who have some knowledge of the matter beforehand, and desire further information and direction; and 2ndly, Those whom the lecturer may attract to the study of that subject.

I confess it is to address these two classes of hearers (especially the latter) that I have consented to appear in the capacity of a lecturer here to-night. The subject I have chosen is both interesting and important.

*The introductory part of this Lecture was read only at Southwell.

We have in this place much good Church Music provided for us, and there are many helps and advantages for those willing to cultivate this study: and regarding as I do, Music as an important branch of education, I should be very glad of the formation of a Choral Society, or Singing Classes, for relaxation or innocent amusement,—or, still better, to enable *the people* to take, as they ought, a greater share in the service and praise of God in His Church.

I have spoken of Music as a branch of education. Mr. Maurice, in his valuable lectures on "Learning and Working," delivered last year at Willis' Rooms in behalf of the Working Man's College, says, that "of all experiments in English Education, beyond comparison the most successful has been that for diffusing a knowledge of music, and a love of music among our people. The Mechanics Institutes have attracted a few men here and there, and those generally not mechanics; the classes of Mr. Hullah have brought thousands together of both sexes in London and in every part of England. Every order down to the lowest has felt the impulse. Numbers, instead of merely hearing lectures about music, have actually learned to sing; and no one can look at their faces at one of their great meetings, and not perceive with what hearty delight, and with what comparative indifference to mere display and effect they exercise their gift."

"Now these," says Mr. Maurice, "are most significant facts, facts which require to be reflected on. If music has taken stronger hold of those whom we desire to educate than any other study has done, especially if it has laid hold of them when we had thought that any other study would have been more in agreement with their previous tastes and habits of mind, there must be something in it which may help us to understand what is needed in all studies, something which may deepen and widen our thoughts respecting the nature of education itself."

Mr. Maurice (who confesses himself to be "an utterly dull and incapable listener,") proceeds to say that he "attaches great importance to this movement towards musical education. 1. Because it is useless to impart what men are not willing to receive; and here is an index of what they are willing to receive; and 2dly, because it seems a most healthful instinct which has led them, while comparatively indifferent to much that has been offered to them, to select what we should have called a mere amusement or gratification. If the higher classes have made Music a mere amusement or gratification, so much the worse for them. I believe to the working people it must be more than that, or it will not be that." "Their instinct is possibly sounder than our criticism. They may have discovered the very truth which we have nearly forgotten; their welcoming of music may be a sign that they want something deeper and better than all *mere indoctrination*." So far Mr. Maurice,—and if by *mere indoctrination* he means, as I suppose he does, a system of education like that of Thomas Gradgrind in Dickens' "Hard Times," i, e., a mere cramming of facts,—"Facts, sir, facts, and nothing else,"—I most cordially agree with Mr. Maurice.

The branch of music that I have chosen for this evening's lecture is *Church Music*. And by Church Music I mean *that Music only that was composed and appropriated expressly for the use of the Church in her properly appointed Services*, and which has been so used by her, as I shall shortly show you, from time immemorial.

I maintain, then, that the whole Liturgy, or Service of the Church, always used to be, and for hearty, united, congregational worship, always should be, a *Musical Service*.

And on these grounds:—

1. Because such a Service is the most decorous, and in fact absolutely necessary for hearty, united, congregational worship.

2. Because it is the most *natural*, and the most in accordance with the dictates of *common sense*.
3. On Utilitarian principles. And
4. Because it is warranted and sanctioned by the universal consent and practice of all nations, ancient and modern.

I shall then cite a few testimonies in support of my views, and as I believe some persons are silly enough to consider choral services as having somewhat of a popish or semi-popish character, I shall only bring forward such witnesses as I think you will acquit of any bias in favour of Romanism.

I shall then proceed to give you a brief account of the music of the Church from the earliest ages, and the gentlemen of the choir, who are so kind as to assist me, will give you some illustrations of the ancient chants, and anthems, and hymns, and carols.

Before I proceed however, I may as well here dispose of an objection sometimes urged, viz., the *unpopularity* of a choral service. A man may say, as men sometimes do say, "I don't like music." To this simple statement I can imagine but one reply,—"Don't you? I am sorry for you." But if he should go on to say, "*I* don't like the choral service, I think it ought to be put down,"—here he begins to argue. Here is a simple statement, or proposition, and an inference drawn from it. Now we may admit the importance of the fact of this individual's taste, but I don't see that we are equally bound to admit the inference that he draws. I don't see how *his individual opinion* affects the *merits of the thing itself*. I cannot see that because John Tomkins cannot appreciate the music of the Church, that *therefore* the music of the Church ought to be "put down." John Tomkins may not *like* the finest compositions of Mendelssohn or Handel so well as the classic melodies of "Pop goes the Weasel," or "The Ratcatcher's Daughter;" but I don't see that we ought *therefore* to be robbed for ever of the "Elijah," or the

"Hallelujah Chorus." If it be said, "The people" don't like a choral service, I simply deny the fact.—I maintain that "the people" *do* like it. I know of Churches where the choral service has been introduced to the satisfaction and delight of marvellously increased congregations. If it be said, They go only to hear the music,—I would reply, What right hast thou to judge thy brethren, thou Pharisee? Is there *no* sincerity in a cathedral? Is there no hypocrisy in a conventicle? No,—the opposition to choral service, if such be made, does *not* come from "the people," from the mass of the congregations. It never comes from the majority of the fervent worshippers, the devout communicants.

First, then, That a Musical Service is the most decorous, and absolutely necessary for hearty, united, congregational worship.

You will all, I think, willingly admit that the great objects of Divine Worship are edification, prayer, and praise;—that, as the Apostle tells us, all things should be done in the Church "to edifying," and that all should be done "decently and in order;" that the praise of God is the very highest occupation in which any created being can be employed,—for prayer relates to *our* sins and miseries, praise to God's goodness and mercy,—prayer is our occupation as mortals and sinners, praise a privilege which we share with angels and spirits of just men made perfect,—prayer will cease with our present lives, praise, as we hope, will last for eternity. You will also admit that the truth of our Bishop's words, in his recent charge,—"What is wanted, is to make the services more *interesting* by infusing into them more *life* and *reality*," so as to have a "congregation *uniting heart and voice* in prayer and praise to God." And, says Bishop Jackson, "*that* mode of conducting the Service is the best in which the congregation *can* join in most heartily, and which most animates and sustains their devotional feelings."

Now I believe that this can best and only be done,

and that the congregation *can* only join heartily and properly by the use of a musical tone,—and I will try to prove it to you.

Oblige me by reading out loud, each in your own manner the words written above me,—pray read out loud and heartily, and read to the end.

(The inscription, printed in large letters, was the well known passage from Shakspeare, "The man that hath no music in himself, &c." The request was very generally complied with, and the result was, of course, a Babel of confused noise.)

Now hear the choir. (The choir chanted the same in a monotone on G.)

Now try and read with the choir and in the same tone. (The effect was very striking, and elicited loud applause.)

You admit, then, that if you are to *join* in acts of worship or praise *heartily*, it is most decorous, and absolutely necessary to do so in a musical tone.

You have now admitted the *principle*, the staple, the groundwork of what is vulgarly called "Full Cathedral Service." All the rest, chants, services, suffrages, anthems, hymns, as I hope to show, follow as a necessary consequence.

2. In the next place, I assert that a Musical Service is the most natural, and most in accordance with the dictates of common sense.

A chanted service is sometimes objected to on the ground that it is "unnatural," "artificial." Now this is not the proper time to discuss the proper meaning of the terms "natural," and "state of nature." But, if it be meant by "state of nature," that man originally "wild in woods a noble savage ran," that he was only a superior kind of baboon; that, all laws, arts, and civilisation,—that all the comforts, ornaments, and decencies of polished society,—that all the cultivation in fact of the gifts of sense, of the eye, and of the ear, and also of the intellect and abilities with which God has so bountifully endowed him; that all these are

debasing *corruptions*,—*artificial*, and *unnatural*, and *therefore* ought to be eschewed and repudiated; why we must return to the habits of our forefathers of old, we must dine upon acorns, and paint our bodies blue.

But seriously, our whole Liturgy is a work of art, and a savage would not be likely to build a cathedral. We advocate employing the art of Architecture to the service of GOD,—why not the art of Music? Why not consecrate and sanctify to promote His glory and praise *all* the arts and faculties, and powers which are His gifts, and which He has given us?

But, I repeat, a musical service *is* the *most natural*.

What is one great reason why our congregations are so silent in Church? I am sure that many who are silent would be very glad to speak if they could do so in the way that *nature* dictates, i. e., in a monotone, a musical tone, or chant. People go to Church, and intend fairly to join in the responses, but in practice they do not,—and why? because the present way of attempting to say them in unmusical tones is *unnatural*. For congregational worship we want all the people to *say the same words* at the *same time;* and to do this congregationally and heartily, it *must* be done, as you have admitted, by a musical harmonious recitation; there *cannot* be any *harmony* of many voices pronouncing the same sounds together but what is musical.

You must know that all the ordinary colloquial tones of the human voice are but broken fragments of musical notes. They are all notes, though broken and many harsh. A music master would tell you that the tones of the voice during ordinary conversation lie within the compass of a fifth, ranging between C and G, or D and A, according to the pitch. Expressions of surprise ascend sometimes to the octave, and occasionally to the seventh. Were man a perfect being, his common speech would be melody. Can we give higher praise to a human voice than to say it is sweet and melodious? Do we not admire most a musically speaking voice?

Now a musical ear, (I don't say a *good* musical ear,) is much more common than is generally supposed. If people attempt to say the responses all together in unmusical tones, see what difficulties are in the way. Each man hears his neighbours around him, speaking each in his own time and in his own tone. Every man's voice sounds prominently and individually, and the discord of sound, and confusion of sense become perplexing. They weary you, or you fancy yourself conspicuous, and you leave off speaking, hardly conscious why, although you will readily feel the reason if you attend to your sensations. When, however, as Mr Hullah has shown, people are speaking *in the same musical tone*, although every one is conscious that he is speaking, yet he scarcely hears his own voice, it is lost in the general body of sound. Thus it is that many well disposed persons in Church begin and attempt to respond aloud, but there is felt to be a something that takes away their zeal, and gradually seals their lips, those first who have the acutest ears, and so they remain quiet, and you only hear the voice of the parish clerk and the school children,—who by the way always speak, when they speak together, in a *chant*. Go into any school and hear the children read or repeat anything, and you will soon be convinced of this, in fact, when a common sentiment is expressed by a number of persons in musical intonation and rhythm, it resembles the measured tread of a well disciplined regiment; its very order is expressive of earnestness, solemnity, and force. But the same thing murmured or talked prosaically resembles rather the disorderly walk of a rabble, confused, jostling each other, with stragglers dropping off on all sides.

I think, then, you will admit that if a mass of people, speaking together, and under strong religious impressions, follow the dictates of nature, they will speak in the same time and tone, i. e., they will *chant*. Look into common life, and you invariably find that

when people are *speaking out*, they abandon that prosy tone of voice which we consider so "natural." Children at play, sailors singing to each other during their work, the cries in the streets, the cheers of a mob,—these are vulgar instances; but their very vulgarity is a proof that they spring from universal and *natural* causes.

If a child, that has but just learnt to talk, receive unkind treatment from a playfellow, it *chants* out its little griefs into its mother's ear, with eyes filled with tears, that give sufficient evidence of sincerity and *naturalness*. When children want to obtain any indulgence, or a present, we must all acknowledge that the coaxing tones *nature* suggests to them for ensuring the success of their petition, have much more affinity with *chanting* than with the instructions of Walker or Sheridan. Once more. Why do we adopt a subdued and civil tone of voice when speaking to our superiors? Would any one, when saying his prayers, dare to address his Maker in the ordinary tone of colloquial conversation? We must either *preach* our prayers, or *talk* our prayers, both of which are irreverent; or else we must, more or less musically or unmusically (and why unmusically?) *chant* them.

Chanting, musically or unmusically, is the natural key in which vent is given to a large and important class of devotional feelings; the chanting of the Church is this voice correctly timed and tuned to harmony. Chanting, is simply *reading or reciting melodiously*. Non-chanting, common reading is artificial. No one hears an uneducated person attempt to read in the same tone as he speaks. What we call "*good* reading," is an artificial drill, the correction of *natural*, undisciplined locution. Who ever reads or repeats anything in what is called his *natural*, i. e. his talking voice? and if this be natural, why is the great difficulty of the "*art* of reading" in getting children out of what we call a "sing-song," i. e. a *chant?*

3 Another excellence of a musical service is its *utility*. Not to dwell on the fact that chanting is less exertion to the minister than reading, (for this perhaps we need not consider,) words when chanted are more easily and better heard than when they are read. "In small buildings," says Sir J. Herschell, "the velocity of sound is such that the dimensions of the building are traversed by the reflected sound in a time too small to admit of the echo being distinguished from the principal sound. In great ones the echo is heard after the principal sound has ceased; and if the building be so constructed as to return several echoes in different times, the effect will be unpleasant." This is one reason why it is a greater exertion to read, and more difficult to hear, the Lessons than the Prayers in large Churches--for we all, more or less, chant the prayers. A moderate voice, pitched as good chanting requires, will, by giving time for the echo, easily reach a point quite inaccessible if reading in a talking voice be adopted.

4. I shall not at present dwell on the antiquity of, or the authority for, a Musical Service. I am now only appealing to *common sense*. I will, therefore, only allege one more argument—its *universality* This, by the way, also proves its "naturalness."

It is certain, that vestiges of this custom have been found in every quarter of the globe, and in every age. It is certain, that this melodious voice of prayer, so far from being *unnatural*—as a few men of one short generation have presumed to call it—is the very voice which the most untaught children of men, no less than the most civilised, have adopted in their more solemn supplications, whether to known or unknown God, in all ages and generations of mankind. This also answers the ridiculous assertion of its being peculiarly *Popish*. The natives of New Zealand, in their Churches, have assumed a kind of chant, in which they join with so united an effect that but for its power,

it might be mistaken for the voice of one man. They make their responses in a low monotone, which, especially in a large congregation, has an indescribably solemn effect. The sound has been not inaptly compared by Bishop Selwyn to the swell of a distant surf. In the narratives of Captain Cook and the navigators of the last century, we read that this custom was found throughout the South Sea islanders. The same prevailed among the North American Indians. Bishop Heber met with a whole nation in the East Indies who chant—the Bheels. All the Mahometans chant. So do the Brahmins. So do the Buddhists, as we learn from Huc's travels. All the prayers of the Jews are offered up in a kind of chant. In fact, intonation is to the present day (as it was anciently) the custom among Orientals, even when reading privately. "So deeply rooted," says a writer in the 'Parish Choir,' "is the tradition of this custom in the Heathen mind, that the practice of reading the prayers, adopted by the generality of our missionaries, forms in itself a great obstacle to their success." They cannot conceive, and will not be induced to believe, that any act of prayer, or of public devotion can be effectively offered, unless robed in the decorous garb of a chant. The same writer quotes the testimony of a missionary in India, "that when reading the prayers of the Church he could not induce the people to listen to him; no sooner, however, did he adopt the chant by way of experiment, than they not only listened, but expressed the greatest delight;" and this was at Canandugoody, near Tanjore, Madras Presidency. Mr. Layard gives an account of the chanted service of the Nestorian Christians, in Kurdistan, who retain the same customs as those which prevailed in the ancient Chaldean Church. Charles Lamb, in one of his Essays of "Elia," speaks of the Quakers delivering their exhortations, or expounding sermons, or addresses, with a "low buzzing musical sound;" and Macaulay, in one of his late volumes, speaks of the

"strange chant" used by George Fox, their founder. In fact, very many of those who dissent from the Church, and have a pious horror of anything like chanting, do themselves really chant their prayers, only they do not do it very musically. If you have ever heard extempore praying from the mouths of illiterate persons, you must have been struck with the rude, unmodulated, but decided *chant* in which it is delivered.

I have dwelt at some length on this point, because, the plain chant, the monotone is, as I said, the groundwork, the staple, the *warp*, of what is vulgarly but incorrectly called the Cathedral Service. All the rest is the natural development and consequence of the principle of a plain chant, or song, or monotone, or musical tone.

I shall, however, here introduce a few authorities in support of a choral service; not because I think it needs such authorities, nor because I regard those that I shall bring forward as high authorities on the subject, but principally to show you that the principle for which I contend has been admitted by those who cannot be suspected of any bigoted prejudice in favour of the Choral Service of the Church of England, or of any secret bias towards Popish, or semi-Popish sympathies.

Mr. Law, in his well-known "Serious Call," advises us to "begin all our prayers with a *psalm*. I do not mean," he says, "that you should *read* over a psalm, but you should *chant* or *sing* one of those psalms which we commonly call the reading psalms. For singing is the proper use of a psalm—a psalm is a sacred song to be sung—a psalm only *read* is very much like a prayer that is only looked over. The method of *chanting* a psalm, such as is used in some Churches, is such as all persons are capable of. The change of voice in thus chanting of a psalm is so small and natural that every one is able to do it, and yet sufficient to raise and keep up the gladness of our hearts.

"The difference between singing and reading a psalm," he continues, "will easily be understood, if

you consider the difference between reading and singing a common song that you like. Whilst you only *read* it, you only *like* it, and that is all; but as soon as you sing it, then you enjoy it. You feel the *same spirit* within you that seems to be in the words;—a song of praise not sung, is very like any other good thing not made use of."

This is very true. And yet you may hear most excellent, conscientious, and religious people who think it quite "shocking" and "Popish" to chant a prayer —singing, and to most airy and pretty tunes, with all sorts of turns and shakes and flourishes, hymns that are in fact most solemn prayers. There are very few stanzas in the hymns of Wesley and Watts, in which the language of prayer is not used; and none surely will contend that a prayer is less a prayer, whether it be in verse or prose. What a solemn prayer is the Evening Hymn! Yet who would think that publicly *reading* it is the most proper use of the Evening Hymn? Again, our National Anthem is, from first to last a most beautiful prayer. But did ever any one insist on *talking through* "God Save the Queen," because he had conscientious scruples against "chanting prayer"?

The spiritually-minded *Henry Martyn*, who sacrificed his life in the East as a self-devoted missionary, says of the service of his College Chapel at Cambridge, "The music of the chant and anthem seemed in my ears as the sounds of Heaven. My heart ascended to God my Saviour, and I was inclined to have it drawn out in love and tenderness to God and man. During the anthem I seemed to have a foretaste of Heaven, and could have wished to die or to live alway in that frame in which I found myself." And again; "In my walk I was greatly cast down, except for a short time on my return, when as I was singing, or rather *chanting*, some petitions in a low plaintive voice, I insensibly felt myself sweetly engaged in prayer."

"The best chants," says the *Edinburgh Review*, in a

late number, "are the simplest kind of music known, consisting of a few notes, perpetually reiterated. A congregation can far more easily learn to join in this kind of psalmody, than in the ordinary hymn-tunes, which are much more complex. We know village churches where the whole congregation join in the strains of Farrant, and Tallis, and the Gregorian tones; and it is found that when the people are thus trained to take an intelligent part in the musical portion of the Liturgy, they will not leave their responses in the prayers to the listless articulation of the clerk."

"The Church Service," says the *Westminister Review*, (of which Sir W. Molesworth was the founder and editor,) was composed to the measure of a musical recitation, and was not intended to be read, in our sense of the term, unless as an occasional exception to the common rule. The rule is now the exception; and hence arises much of the force of the objections of Dissenters to the monotonous and vain repetitions of the Liturgy." (Of course you don't expect me to agree quite with the Westminister Reviewer.) "They are certainly monotonous when read or repeated in the tone of a person speaking, but when chanted or sung, as originally intended, with varying cadences, the effect is wholly different. The same words call up new emotions with every new form of musical expression."

My next three witnesses are three eminent ministers of the three * denominations of Protestant Dissenters.

1. *Mr. Thomas Binney*, a well-known Minister of the Independents, published, not long since, what he called an Oration and Argument, entitled, "The Service of Song in the House of the LORD." In this, he strongly advocates chanting. He enjoins the antiphonal—or alternate chanting of the Psalms, on Scriptural grounds. He speaks of "those heavenly-descended hymns, technically denominated *Benedictus* and *Magnificat*." He mentions the tradition about the *Te Deum*, that when S. Augustin was baptized by S. Ambrose,

*Two.

while they were at the font, they sung this hymn by inspiration, as the SPIRIT gave them utterance. "This story," says he "which the learned reject as fabulous, is precisely what Paul teaches as having occurred in the Primitive Church. *It had Psalms and Psalmody direct from Heaven.*" To those who would object to singing a prayer, a Creed, or text from Scripture, Mr. Binney says, "The Service of Song in the House of the LORD, may include not only *direct praise*, but all the exercises and emotions of the heart. The varied vicissitudes of the inward life, may find fitting expression here: the works and ways of GOD; the great facts of our spiritual Redemption (i. e. the Creed;) all that faith realizes—all that hope desires and expects—may find in the psalmody of the Church some form of appropriate united utterance."

I may add, that there is published, for the use of Mr. Binney's congregation, and chanted, I believe, in his meeting-house in London, a collection of psalms and hymns, gathered, many of them, from the music of the ancient Church, including the Gregorian tones. I see, too, that they have been lately advertising for a "Schoolmaster and *Precentor*."

2. *Mr. Beecher*, the brother of the authoress of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and a Baptist* minister at New York, describing a choral service he attended at Stratford-on-Avon, says, "The portions which most affected me were, the *prayers* and responses, which the choir sang; and it seemed as though I heard not with my ear, but with my soul. I was dissolved; my whole being seemed irresistibly, yet gently drawn towards GOD. When in the prayers, breathed forth in strains of sweet, simple, solemn music, the love of CHRIST was recognized, how I longed then to give utterance to what that love seemed to me. Whenever an 'Amen' occurred, it was given by the choir, accompanied by the organ and congregation. Oh! that swell and cadence ring in my ear yet! Not once, not a single time did it occur in that service from beginning to end, without bring-

* Congregationalist.

ing tears into my eyes. I never knew—I never dreamed before, of what heart there was in the word Amen!"

3. "Music," says *Dr. Cumming*, the well-known Presbyterian, "may be regarded as a handmaid of Christian worship, auxiliary to the effort of the worshipper,—an interpreter, in short, of those deep and thrilling emotions of the Christian heart, of which song alone can be the appropriate exponent and vehicle." "And," asks Dr. Cumming, "if we are to have music at all, why not have the best music, and in the best manner? Why should the psalmody of our congregations be a penance to the musical ear?"

Lastly, as to the Popish tendency of chanting, hear Dr. Cumming. "I think," says he, "the *chant, the most purely Protestant* music: the common tune and metrical hymn are GOD'S Word, shaped and adapted to man's music, but the chant is GOD'S Word, retained as the SPIRIT gave it, and man's music following and unfolding it."

I may mention, that I have seen in a newspaper this morning, (March 13th,) an extract from the *Nonconformist*, describing the introduction of a "Biblical Liturgy" into the chapel of a Mr. David Thomas, at Stockwell, last Sunday week. The service commenced with singing a "Sanctus," and was closed with a "chant." "The chant," says the *Nonconformist*, "strikes us as exquisitely beautiful—full of tenderness and truest devotion; every Canticle (?) or verse, ending with the prayer, 'Take not Thy HOLY SPIRIT from me:' which is thus, after the manner of the 136th Psalm, the refrain of the entire chant. The idea is a most felicitous one." (The *Nonconformist* does not seem to be aware that this "felicitous idea" has been the custom of the Church from the beginning.) "The idea is a most felicitous one; it gives transcendent power and impressiveness to the Psalm. The *prayer* becomes *an intense and passionate pleading*. Its recital by a whole congregation must be well-nigh overpowering."

To these testimonies I will only add one more of a different kind.

"Some years ago," writes a correspondent, in a recent number of the *Clerical Journal*, "I returned from France, after a residence there of some years, in company with a well-educated Roman-Catholic gentleman. He stayed with me some weeks, and together we went to see the sights of London. One day I asked whether he would like to visit Westminster Abbey; he said he did not wish to attend service, but should like to see the building. We went in the afternoon, and, while inspecting the monuments, service commenced. As the words of the Magnificat, chanted by the choir, came floating on the air, he paused abruptly, listened while the music lasted with the greatest reverence, and then whispered '*allons y*;' we went, we stayed throughout the service, to which my friend paid the greatest attention. As we left the Abbey, he said to me very gravely, 'My good friend, you cannot think how powerfully I am affected by the service I have just heard. Would I could join in it regularly. You know,' he continued, 'that the bulk of my countrymen are dissatisfied with many of the doctrines of the Roman Church; but Protestantism, the doctrines of which they prefer generally, is presented to them in such a repulsive aspect, that they are deterred from entertaining it. Those long and ill-digested extemporaneous prayers, in which no one can join the minister—those hymns, devoid of beauty and badly sung—the coldness of the service frightens us. No!' said he, 'Protestantism, as now known in France, will make but slow progress; but, were a Church presented to us, offering Episcopal jurisdiction, the doctrines of Protestantism and such a public service as I have just heard, depend upon it the bulk of our educated countrymen would enter its communion. We wish,' said he, 'for reformation, we want to be members of a Church, not Dissenters'"

I will now appeal to what I myself consider much

greater authorities than those I have cited. I mean, the authority of the Bible, and the witness and practice of the Church.

First of all, then, as far as has been revealed to us, the holy and blessed inhabitants of heaven above "rest not day or night," *singing* ceaseless songs of praise. At the Creation, "the morning stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for joy;" and at the Redemption, a multitude of the heavenly host chanted an anthem of praise. When heaven was opened to the vision of the prophet Isaiah, and he saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and the Seraphim doing their homage, "one *cried unto another* (here is antiphonal—alternate—singing) and said, 'Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory.'"

And, in like manner, the Church triumphant, in the Revelation to S. John, was praising God after this manner. So (ch. vii.) when "the multitude (that represent the people) cried with a loud voice, 'Salvation to our God, Who sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb.'" And then the angels and elders (the Priesthood) perform their part, saying, "Amen, Blessing, and Glory, and Wisdom, and Thanksgiving, and Honour, and Power, and Might, be unto our God."

They are revealed, in like manner, in Chapter xix. "I heard a great voice of much people in Heaven, saying, 'Alleluia!'" This they repeat. Then the twenty-four elders take up their part as before, and answer, "Amen, Alleluia!" Then a voice came "out of the Throne, saying, 'Praise our God!'" upon which the people resume their part, and answer again, "as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, 'Alleluia, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!'"

To come now to earth:—

The earliest specimen we have of a choral hymn of praise in either profane or sacred story, is the thanks-

giving psalm of the Israelites after the passage of the Red Sea. "Then sang *Moses and the children of Israel* this song unto the LORD,

> "I will sing unto the LORD, for He hath triumphed gloriously :
> The horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea !"

"And Miriam the prophetess took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women followed her with timbrels and dances. And Miriam answered them;" i. e., she and the women sung the response to the choruses of men—

> "Sing ye to the LORD, for He hath triumphed gloriously :
> The horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea !"

The song of Deborah and Barak seems to have been chanted or sung in alternate strains. When David returned from the slaughter of Goliath, we read, "the women came out of all the cities of Israel to meet King Saul, with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music. And the women *answered* one another, and said, (i. e., one choir,) "Saul has slain his thousands,"—and then the response, "And David his ten thousands."

The exertions of the man after GOD's own heart, King David, to regulate the Tabernacle music, were remarkable. We find him not disdaining to mingle with the company of singers, but uniting to swell the general thanksgiving. He seems to have composed as well the music as the poetry of the tabernacle. He multiplied the number of performers; determined the distinctive situation of each; introduced many new instruments, and with the most sedulous care acted as the director of the whole band. The service of GOD was literally continuous. We are told, (1 Chron. ix. 33.) "The singers, the chiefs of the Fathers of the Levites, were employed in that work *day and night*." For this purpose they were divided into twenty-four courses, and were so greatly multiplied in number, that towards the close of David's life, he enumerates "four thousand who praised the LORD with instruments," and "the

number of them, with their brethren, that were instructed in the songs of the LORD, were two hundred fourscore and eight."

We may be sure that the service of GOD in the Temple built by the magnificent Solomon had no less grandeur than under King David. We read that he introduced into it, among other treasures, "all the instruments" which David his father had dedicated, adding harps of peculiar richness, and installing the musicians in their respective offices. The singers in his Temple were all "arrayed in white linen,"—i. e. *surplices*. He was also himself a diligent composer; his songs being a thousand and five. We read, also, that the ALMIGHTY was pleased to mark His approbation of Solomon's piety at the Temple dedication. "It came to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were *as one* to *make one sound to be heard* in praising and thanking the LORD," (here is *unison*,) "and when they lift up their voice with the trumpets, and cymbals, and instruments of music, and praised the LORD, saying, 'For He is good; for His mercy endureth for ever':—that then the house was filled with a cloud," (i. e. the token of the visible Presence of GOD,) "even the House of the LORD." *

We read of similar care for the music and service of GOD in the reigns of Jehoash, Hezekiah, and Josiah; and, after the captivity, in the books of Nehemiah and Ezra: and thus it continued till the days of our LORD.

To come now to the New Testament. It is acknowledged that the public service of the primitive Church was modelled, in a great degree, on that of the Temple. The first Christians attended "daily in the Temple;" and in their own assemblies they continued the use of those Psalms which formed the groundwork of their ancient Liturgy. This continued use became one of the chief characteristics of Christian worship. And with the Psalms themselves, it is not to be believed that

*2 Chron. v. 12, 13.

they did not adopt the manner of their performance also. If they retained the Psalms, they would, of course, retain the music, *the tunes to which they were sung.* Our LORD sang a hymn with His disciples on the night preceding His Passion. Paul and Silas in the prison at midnight "prayed and sang praises," (or, as it might more accurately be translated, "praying hymned) unto GOD." S. James bids his converts to "sing psalms." S. Paul tells the Colossians to "admonish *one another*" (i. e. antiphonally,) "in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs;" and the Ephesians, "speaking *to yourselves*" (i. e. antiphonally again) "in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the LORD."

To come to history—Pliny writing to the Emperor Trajan (A. D. 104) a very few years after the death of S. John, says of the Christians' worship, that they used to "sing alternately a hymn to CHRIST as GOD." S. Ignatius, who was at that time Bishop of Antioch, is said (like Isaiah) to have seen a vision of angels praising GOD alternately, and he conducted the worship in his own Church on that model. S. Augustine tells us that in the Church of S. Athanasius, at Alexandria, the champion of the orthodox faith in the fourth century, "he that read the Psalms used so little variation of voice, that he seemed rather to pronounce than to sing." He elsewhere tells us that the same manner of singing prevailed throughout all Africa. S. Basil the Great, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Syria, speaks of it as the received custom of all the East; describing the worship in his Church, he says—"dividing ourselves into two parts, we sing antiphonally one to another; sometimes we permit one alone to begin the Psalm, and the rest join in the close of every verse."

About the same time we read of attention paid to this matter by Damasus, Bishop of Rome, and soon afterwards by S. Chrysostom, at Constantinople. S. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, in the same century, bestowed

much pains in arranging the ancient hymn tunes or tones or chants of the Church. He tells us that in his Church "from the responsories of the Psalms, and singing of men, women, virgins, and children, there resulted an harmonious noise like the waves of the sea." About the same time S. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, in Gaul, says, "Let him that *stands without the Church* hear the voice of the people praying; let him perceive the glorious sound of our hymns, and hear the responses of our devout confession in the offices of the divine Sacraments." In the next century, S. Jerome tells us that the hearty 'Amen' of the people in his day sounded like a thunderclap.

In the seventh century, the Church tunes or tones were re-collected and re-arranged and reformed by Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome, from whom the old Church music is frequently called Gregorian. This is the foundation and groundwork and, as it were, the elements of all the finest old Church music

You are all doubtless aware that the service of the Church was entirely a musical service throughout the Middle Ages down to the Reformation.

So it was, and after the Reformation too, as I shall show you.

You all well know that one of the great improvements in our Reformation was,—that, whereas before, the service was written and performed in the Latin language, —now we have the service in the vulgar or common tongue that it may be "understanded of the people."

Again, whereas before the Reformation, there was a great multiplicity of service books, that now we have one "Common Prayer Book,"—in the Preface of which we read, "Whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this realm; some following Salisbury use, some the use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln; now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use."*

If a Roman Catholic were to call ours (as they do

*[English Prayer Book.]

sometimes,) a new Church, and ask where it was before Luther, English Churchmen would, I trust, be able to answer that ours is no new Church, but the old Catholic Church of the Apostles, purified from the corruptions which we believe Rome had engrafted upon it. So also we have the old Liturgy, the framework of which, as well as much of its substance, has come down to us from the Apostolic age; and with the old Liturgy we would retain also that old way of using it, which is commonly called the chant, which has likewise come down from the Apostles' days, and which was purified, and simplified, and sanctioned by our Reformers.

In 1544, the Litany was no sooner translated into English, than it was set to a simple form of the old music by Archbishop Cranmer. This was the first part of the Prayer Book that was used in the vulgar tongue, and the chant to which Cranmer set it, and which is supposed to be as ancient as any chant possessed by the Western Church, has been used with it ever since to this day.

In 1549 appeared King Edward VI.'s First Prayer Book. In this the injunctions for singing the different parts of the Communion office are imperative.

In 1550, the entire Prayer Book, including Versicles, Responses, Canticles, Collects, and Athanasian Creed, together with all parts of the Communion office, including Creed, Offertory, Sanctus, Gloria in excelsis, Collects and Anthems, and the Burial Service also, were set to the old music and published by *John Merbecke*, Organist of Windsor, and called "The Book of Common Prayer Noted," i. e. with the musical notes.

Merbecke was a zealous Reformer. He wrote out a concordance of Holy Scripture with his own hand. He was condemned to be burnt for his Protestantism, under Queen Mary, along with some others who actually suffered. Merbecke, however, escaped through his good conduct. Fox, the author of the "Book of Martyrs," says of Merbecke in the 2nd edition of his 'Acts and

Monuments,' in 1858, "he yet liveth, GOD be praised, and yet to this present singeth merrily, and playeth on the organs."

Merbecke's book was no new composition, but simply an adaptation to the English Liturgy of that music and those melodies which had been in use in the Church Service from times immemorial. His book contains the authorized music to the Reformed Liturgy, as used and performed in the Chapel Royal of King Edward VI. There is scarcely an instance of more than one note set to a syllable; and this was most probably the result of the known wishes of Archbishop Cranmer, who not only desired the banishment of figured music from the Church, but the simplification of the plain song so that it would be clear and adapted to the sense and understanding of the people.* Merbecke's book contains the groundwork of the plain song as used in our cathedrals from the Reformation to the present day.

Passing over the dismal reign of Queen Mary,—as soon as Queen Elizabeth came to the throne, she issued (in 1559) an injunction that "there be a modest and distinct song so used in all parts of the common prayers in the Church that the same may be as plainly understanded as if it were read without singing." And in the Rubric of the Prayer Book published in her reign it is said,—"*To the end the people may the better hear*, in such places where they do sing, there shall the *Lessons* be *sung in a plain tune*, after the manner of distinct reading: and likewise the Epistle and Gospel."

Merbecke's book contained only single notes,—i. e. only the melody. In the following year (1560) appeared 'Day's Service Book,' which was harmonized. Similar books were published by the celebrated Tallis,

*Merbecke was employed by Cranmer to *reform* the Church music of the time, and so to *restore* the ancient *plain song*, as a substitute for the figured style then generally adopted. *Reformation*, restoration of what was pure and edifying, not the invention of novelties, was the object our Reformers had in view, as in other matters, so also in the music of the Church.

whose glorious harmonies were very generally adopted; by Barnard just before the great Rebellion; and, after the Restoration, by Lowe. In fact we have an uninterrupted series of authorized choral services composed for our Church from the time of King Edward VI, till the last revision of the Prayer Book in 1661,—not two hundred years ago.

The service of the Church was always 'sung' in very many Churches until the Great Rebellion. The plain song was also resumed at the Restoration, and used till a much later period, even in parish Churches than is generally imagined. There is a judgment of Lord Stowell, in 1792, recognizing the practice in parish Churches as strictly in accordance with the law of the Church and of the land.

Before I conclude this part of my subject, I must remark briefly on two points.

1. That our Prayer Book nowhere recognises the difference between what is vulgarly called a 'Cathedral Service' and a 'Parochial Service.'

The only ground for such a supposition that I know is that Rubric which modern cathedral choirs generally disobey every Sunday,—viz., the Rubric after the third collect,—"In choirs and places where they sing—" (i. e., in places where they have a trained choir,)—"here followeth the anthem."*

2. The second point is the meaning of the words often occurring in the Rubrics. When we take up our Prayer Books, we find that certain portions of the offices are directed to be 'said' or 'sung,' others 'read,' others 'pronounced.' Now, in explaining these directions, we must of course endeavour to ascertain what meaning was given to these terms at the period when the Prayer Book was compiled, and not how they may be twisted in the present day. On reference to authorized works, we find that these were technical ecclesiastico-musical terms. The word 'say' referred to the *then* universal manner of saying the prayers,—viz., in plain song or

*[Rubric after 'The Collect for Grace' in the English Prayer Book.]

monotone; the word 'sing' implied the choral celebration. This distinction is also shown by the Rubric I have just quoted—In choirs and places where they '*sing*,' i. e., where the choral method, and not the mere monotone is in use. Evening Prayer is in the calendar called '*Evensong*.' [Eng. P. Book.]

This is also clear from the very title-page of the Prayer Book;—"Together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, *pointed* as they are to be sung or said,"—i. e., musically recited.* They are not pointed as they are to be *read*, in the present meaning of that word, as we would read a sermon or a book, for thus to divide them would often make gross nonsense of them,—e g., "How shall we sing the LORD'S song: in a strange land?" The points or stops are musical directions, and in the old music you will find *bars* put in these places, and here only.

I could also show you, if it were necessary, from the Prayer Book, that the word 'read' is sometimes used in the same sense, viz., for reading musically,—e g., the Rubric before the 'Venite:'—"Then shall be *said* or *sung* this Psalm following, except on the 19th day of the month, it is not to be *read* here, but in the ordinary course of the Psalms." The learned Bingham who wrote in the time of King George I., speaks of the "*musical* way of *reading* the Psalms now in our cathedral churches."

Our forefathers were not so inconsistent, not to say absurd, as we are in these enlightened days. They did not think it wrong to sing the beautiful translation of David's Psalms in the Prayer Book, but think it right, after talking through these, to sing what we may almost call the doggrel of Sternhold and Hopkins, or that version, or rather, dilution from which as has been said, Brady and Tate have extracted all the poetry. They did not think it true Protestantism to sing to a tune that nobody could follow, "LORD, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law," but flat Popery to chant in a strain in which all could join, "Good LORD, deliver us," "We beseech Thee to hear us, Good

*[Unhappily otherwise in the Am. Book. How long to be so?]

LORD." They were not so inconsistent as to say, "O LORD, open Thou our lips, and our mouth shall show forth Thy praise"—to exhort each other—"O come let us SING unto the LORD," and then falsify the whole by what too often becomes a dialogue between the parson and the clerk.

There is, by the way, no authority whatever for this manner of reading the psalms by alternate verses—it is a significant relic of the ancient custom of chanting them antiphonally. Should we think it well to read alternately lines or verses of the Evening Hymn? for the minister to begin, "Glory to Thee, my GOD, this night;" and for the clerk to respond, "For all the blessings of the night," in his talking voice?

I have shown you now—and I fear at wearisome length—that from the dictates of common sense and nature the service of GOD in His Church should be a musical service. I have shown that such service is authorised by the Bible, and has always till of late years been observed by the Church.

It now only remains that you should hear what sort of music should be sung.

We will begin then with the first—the simplest and the easiest, the monotone—and so proceed to the more elaborate.

I have said that the monotone is the groundwork of all choral service. The people in public congregational worship must respond in a monotone, and the minister must not be in discord or jar, but "sing or say" his part in a similar manner, and harmoniously, or the result will be a wretched mixture.

The next step to the monotone, or plain song, would naturally be simple cadences, or melodic accents and inflected responses; such as the Amens, and the short Suffrages or Versicles.

We then arrive at a simple melody for the chanting of the psalms. I have already mentioned and traced down the Gregorian *chants*. They are supposed by some

learned men to have been derived from the music of the Jewish Temple. Some even assert that they are derived from the music of the days of David and Asaph.*

This, though of course incapable of proof, is yet possible; for, it being notorious that Pope Gregory, in the seventh century, merely arranged and reconstructed the Church music already in use; as we have no record of any individual composer before his time, but, on the contrary, we are told that it was in existence in great perfection and sweetness in the time of S. Augustine, in the fifth century, and before him had been collected and preserved with great care by S. Ambrose; as we know that our LORD and His Apostles sang psalms and hymns, which doubtless they would hand down to the churches which they founded; and since those Apostolic hymns and music could only have been of Jewish origin, appropriate to their hymnology, which was the Book of Psalms:—we are all but forced to the conclusion that we have, in the Gregorian music, the spirit, if not the very expression, not only of early Christianity, but of the Jewish Church itself, and of those heavenly "songs of Sion" which the heathen longed to hear by the waters of Babylon.

Now-a-days, all music is written and arranged in only two modes, or scales—the major and the minor. But in old times music was not governed by these rules; and melody, both in the progression of its notes and the manner of its cadences, was such as must of necessity seem strange to ears accustomed only to modern music. The same may be said of the music of uncivilised nations: it is in a different scale or gamut† to ours. Even in our own country we may observe that the cries in the streets, the common songs and choruses of country people, almost always have the cadences in a minor key; and yet most modern music

*[Learnedly maintained by Arthur Bedford; Essay on the Temple Musick. 8vo. 1706.]

† The word *gamut* is derived from the name of the lowest note in the scale of sounds, represented by the third letter of the Greek alphabet, called *gamma*, —G.

is written in the major. Which is the most 'natural?' Which is the most 'artificial?'

Now, S. Ambrose arranged the music of the Church to four scales, or gamuts, or tones. These consisted purely of diatonic intervals, or *natural* notes, as we call them. Gregory added to these four others; or rather, re-arranged them to eight tones: and these eight are what are called the 'Gregorian tones.' There is also another, sometimes called the eighth irregular, sometimes the ninth, sometimes the Peregrine, or Foreign tone; the composition of it being attributed by some to the Emperor Charlemagne.

Gregory also invented that kind of notation by the Roman letters, A, B, C, D, &c., which is used to this day.

S. Augustine, the monk who was sent by S. Gregory to convert the Saxons, brought these 'latest improvements' with him into England.

These simple, plain melodies have been known by the name of Canto Fermo, or Plain Chant, or Cantus Gregorianus. Now, this music was originally sung in unison. It is much questioned whether the ancients were acquainted with harmonies,—singing in parts,—but the song of the Church was long sung in unison. This plain song has laboured under undeserved prejudices, from some mistaken and overstrained views of its not admitting the improvements made in the science of music,—viz., the addition of harmonies, and the utmost artistic skill in its performance. But this is not to do it justice. One of its great merits is, that it is in fact the only music that admits all, learned and unlearned, men, women, and children, to join in it with ease; and so insures hearty response from the congregation, and greater decency and solemnity in the service of God. The unlearned can all join in the tune; those who are able can sing the harmonies.

Good authority can be adduced of the addition of harmony to the Gregorian song from the eleventh cen-

tury downwards, and modern harmony owns the Church as its parent. Guido Aretinus, or of Arezzo, a Benedictine monk, in the eleventh century, is the reputed inventor of counterpoint, or harmony. He added some notes to the scale; and to these he gave the names of *ut*, *re*, *mi*, *fa*, *sol*, *la*. It is said that the idea struck him one day at vespers, when they were singing a hymn to S. John the Baptist, the music of which happened to rise one note on the commencement of every hemistich:—

"*Ut* queant laxis, *Re*sonare fibris,
*Mi*ra gestorum *Fa*muli tuorum,
*Sol*ve polluti *La*bii reatum,
Sancte Joannes."

Five hundred years afterwards, a Fleming added the syllable *si* to the first six, and completed the series. About 1640, Doni, a learned musician, substituted *do* for *ut*, as being more agreeable in solemnization.

You shall now hear some psalms chanted to Gregorian music; and first the 96th Psalm, "Venite Exultemus." This psalm, commonly called the *Invitatory* Psalm, from the matter of it being an invitation to the devout setting forth the praises of GOD, has been used daily from the beginning before the ordinary portion of the Psalms at Morning Prayer. The chant to which it will be sung is called the Eighth Tone. I should say that the principles of these chants differ in some points altogether from ordinary modern music. In the first place, there is no such thing as *time*. It is said that a good musician is half his life learning to keep time, and the other half to break it. It appears that *time*—i. e., notes bearing relation in length to each other—was not practised in the eleventh century. There were no *bars* used in music two hundred years ago, except at the end of a strain. They were multiplied, as music became more elaborate, to mark the emphasis, to help lazy singers, and to keep the proper notes under one another. Chanting is simply a recitation in a musical tone of voice, with a slight inflection or change of tone

at certain fixed points. The music should always be subservient to the words; not, as too often is the case, the words gabbled over, and sacrificed to the air of the chant: every word and syllable distinct, every consonant sounded, every comma attended to; so that the people may hear and *join*. The proper effect of a chant should be, that you should think, not "what a pretty chant that is!" but "how that music brings those words of Holy Scripture home to my heart!"*

These Gregorian melodies were preserved in Merbecke's Prayer Book Noted, published in the reign of King Edward VI.; in Day's Service Book; in Barnard's published in 1641; and also, after the Restoration, in Lowe's and in Clifford's works; and were styled the "Common tunes for the reading Psalms." Thus the Gregorian chants continued to be the regular and authentic melodies of the Church of England, for the chanting of the Psalms, from the seventh till the end of the seventeenth or beginning of the eighteenth century,—more than one thousand years,—when they were gradually superseded by the melodies known as single and double chants.

The differences between the modern chant (*Anglican chant* it is sometimes called, because it originated in the modern English Church) and the Gregorian tone are these: the chant is more metrical—the tone more rhythmical. In the chant, the words are more apt to be sacrificed to the music; in the tone, the music is more strictly adapted to and dependent on the words. In the chant, the number of notes constituting the melody at the middle and end of each verse is uniform; in the tones, the number of inflected notes is very various. I should add, that each Gregorian tone (except the sixth) has several different endings, which gives them the advantage of considerable variety.

But it is not difficult, in looking over any collection

* The choir then sung the "Venite" and some other Psalms to the Gregorian tones from Helmore's Psalter Noted. [Sold by Novello, New York.]

of the earliest English chants, to trace their origin in the Gregorian tones. Many contain fragments of these melodies. Many that you have been in the habit of hearing are but Gregorian tones disguised or mangled. Many chants also were formed out of the harmonies which served as voice or organ accompaniments to the tones, when the melody of the tones was taken in the tenor. This may have been the origin of Turner's well-known chant. In the chant commonly called Tallis's chant for the Venite, the tenor has been converted into the treble, which tenor is nothing more than an adaptation of the first Gregorian tone, fourth ending. These tones have also served as the subject for many hymns and anthems. Handel frequently made use of them: the well-known chorus in the "Messiah," "The LORD gave the Word," is a Gregorian tone.

Another kind of Music in the ancient Church Service, besides the Plain Song, or Canto Fermo, was a more artificial and elaborate kind, adapted to the hymns and solemn offices contained in its ritual. Both these kinds of music suffered soon and greatly from corruptions; and these corruptions, and the efforts made to remove them by the several princes of Europe, especially those of Germany, France, and England, make a considerable part of the history of music.

It has always been the custom in the Church, after reading a Lesson from the Bible, to sing certain hymns or canticles as responsories, as it were; such as the "Te Deum," "Jubilate," "Magnificat," &c.

Now the method of singing the "Te Deum" was, from very ancient times, different from that of the Psalms. From the irregular length of its verses, it is hardly capable of being sung to a common chant. The melody to which it was sung is probably as old as the "Te Deum" itself, which is generally supposed (like the Athanasian Creed) to have been composed in the Church of Gaul, about the fourth or fifth century. This melody, as you shall hear, cannot be strictly called

a chant; it is rather a succession of chants. It was retained by the Reformed English Church, and is given by Merbecke. It forms the groundwork for the "Te Deum" in Tallis's Service. Portions of it also occur in the services of many old English Church composers of that period.

This chant or melody, then, is the true ancient Church strain for the "Te Deum," the original of which is lost in the antiquity of many centuries. It is known by the name of the "Ambrosian Te Deum." This irregular chant was the germ of those arrangements of the canticles, peculiar to the Church of England, technically called "services," consisting of a series of varied airs, partly verse and partly chorus, to which the canticles in all regular choirs are usually sung.*

The whole of the Communion Service ought properly to be a choral service. At present, the only parts sung in most churches are the responses after the Commandments. By the way, it is somewhat strange sometimes to hear persons objecting to what they call *singing prayers*, and yet consent to sing, to an airy tune, these responses, which are in fact most grave and solemn prayers.

There are also two very ancient hymns in our Communion Service,—two angels' hymns,—that commonly called the Sanctus, "Holy, holy, holy, &c.," and the Gloria in Excelsis, "Glory be to God on high."

There are two points not quite correct in our use of the "Sanctus." In the first place, it is usually sung while the minister is going up to the Communion-table, after the Litany. A short psalm, or part of a psalm, ought properly to be sung then, as was formerly the prescribed custom. This was called an "Introit," that is, "He enters," being sung as the minister enters the Communion-rails. The "Sanctus" ought to be sung in its proper place afterwards, where it is now read. The other incorrect practice is that the people ge-

* The choir here sung the "Ambrosian Te Deum," from Helmore's Manual of Plain Song. [Re-published by Pudney & Russel, New York, as adapted to the American Prayer Book by N. B. W.]

nerally join in too soon, at the words, "Therefore with angels and archangels," &c. This is, in fact, part of the preface or introduction to the hymn, "Holy, holy, holy."

The learned Mr. Palmer declares the "Sanctus" to be "the most ancient, the most celebrated, and the most universal of Christian hymns." It is probable that this hymn has been used in the Christian Liturgy of the East and West since the age of the Apostles. Certainly, no Liturgy can be traced in antiquity in which it does not occur. The hymn contains little more than the words which Isaiah describes as being sung by the angels and six-winged seraphim.

The other hymn in the Communion Service is the Gloria in Excelsis, "Glory be to GOD on high," after the reception of the Holy Sacrament; as we read that, after the institution of the LORD's Supper, our SAVIOUR and His disciples sang a hymn before they went to the Mount of Olives.

This celebrated hymn owes its origin to the Eastern Church. It was used at Alexandria in the time of S. Athanasius, in the early part of the fourth century. It is, therefore, more than 1,500 years old; and the Church of England has used it, either at the beginning or end of the Liturgy, for above 1,200 years. I confess that I never read this heavenly hymn in the Church without a strong feeling, that it is most "unnatural" to read these burning words in a dull, prosaic tone,—that it ought to be sung and chanted forth with all our hearts.

You shall now hear the "Sanctus" and the "Gloria in Excelsis," as sung in King Edward VI.'s chapel, from Merbecke's music, arranged by Mr. Helmore.*

I now come to the last kind of strictly Church music —music used in public worship—I mean anthems or hymns. I have spoken of the corruptions of the ancient Church music, and of the frequent attempts to restore it. Perhaps the music of the Church was at no time

*The choir here sung the "Sanctus" and the "Gloria" from the "Manual of Plain Song."

in so low a state as in the age preceding the Reformation; and in no country as in Italy.

It was the great Palestrina, an Italian, born about A. D. 1529, who may be said to have saved Church music from excommunication in 1555, when he was about twenty-six years old. The reigning Pope, Marcellus II., and his Cardinals were so offended with the bad style that then prevailed,—the music had become so florid and so elaborate, that they turned Puritans, and determined upon the Puritanical measure of banishing it from the Church altogether. Palestrina, however, petitioned them to suspend their final judgment till they had heard some music he was composing. They consented, and were so satisfied with the result, that Church music was saved,—i. e., as far as Italy was concerned.

About the same time, by GOD'S Providence, arose in this kingdom a school of Church musicians, second to none of any age or country. This English style progressed under White, Tallis, Byrd, Tye, and Farrant, until it reached a maximum of artistic beauty, mixed with perfect reverence, in the writings of Orlando Gibbons. Perhaps the most accomplished ecclesiastical musician of the present day has declared Palestrina and Gibbons to be the two greatest masters of the art that the world ever saw.

During the troublous times of the two first Stuart kings, especially King Charles I, the style gradually and somewhat deteriorated. The best writers of that age are Child, who was a distinguished Royalist, and Rogers.

Then came the gloomy period of the Protectorate, when the Puritans, the champions of freedom and of the rights of private judgment, refused to Churchmen the religious liberty of worshipping GOD according to their consciences, and abolished the song of the Church, destroying all the musical service-books they could lay their hands upon. The damage thus done was so great, as in a great measure to account for the dearth of the

best old Church music in after times. Nature and music, however, were too strong even for these men; and it is a significant fact that those very men who abused and abolished the choral service, became themselves notorious for their addiction to psalm singing. It would seem, unless they are much belied, that, with regard to the kind of music to which the Psalms should be sung, they considered the chant of the Church a very inferior sort of thing to a good strong nasal twang.

However, after the Restoration, Church music was restored again: but it began now to suffer from the rise of the *opera*. A new, secular, and dramatic element was introduced in the music composed for the profligate court of King Charles II., by Blow, Purcell, and other writers. Purcell, one of the last great musicians of the English school, wrote operas as well as Church music, as also subsequently did the immortal Handel.

You shall now hear two short anthems, composed by two of the most distinguished masters of the old English school—Tallis and Tye. Mind, although I have been speaking of Church music with reference, chiefly, to the part the people may take in the service, I would by no means undervalue the advantages of a highly-trained choir, for the praise of GOD in the most perfect manner that human art and skill—GOD's gifts—can accomplish. The greater part of the music of the Church is purposely and properly intended for the congregation. The anthem is restricted to those who can sing best, and who exercise their talent for the greater glory of GOD. If people cannot appreciate an anthem sung in the Church to the glory of GOD, and intended to excite emotions of devotion and praise, I hope they would never allow themselves to go to a concert or oratorio, to hear "sacred music," merely for the selfish and sensual pleasure of having their ears tickled.

The first anthem is by Tallis. Tallis was born about 1520. He was in the Chapel of King Henry VIII.,

King Edward, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth. There was no separate appointment as organist until the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It appears to have been the custom for the gentlemen of the Chapel to take it in turns to play the organ till her reign, when Tallis and Byrd were appointed organists. Tallis is celebrated for his arrangement of harmonies, which are considered unequalled for their fulness and truly ecclesiastical sublimity. There is still extant an extraordinary composition of his, a "song of forty parts." He died about 1585.

The other anthem is by Dr. Christopher Tye, musical preceptor to Prince Edward, and probably to the other children of King Henry VIII., and afterwards organist to Queen Elizabeth. He was a man as distinguished by his literary attainments as for his accurate musical genius.

There is an anecdote of Dr. Tye, preserved by Anthony Wood. "Dr. Tye," he says, "was a peevish and humoursome man, especially in his latter days; and sometimes playing on the organ in the chapel of Queen Elizabeth, which contained much music, but little delight to the ear, she would send the verger to tell him that he played out of tune; whereupon he sent word that her ears were out of tune." Rather strong language to address to 'stout Queen Bess.'

Sir John Hawkins attributes the origin of the modern anthem to Dr. Tye, "who," he says, "applied himself to the composing of music to words selected from the Psalms of David, in four, five, or more parts; to which species of harmony, for want of a better, the name of anthem, a corruption of antiphon, was applied."

Dr. Tye's ears were not much out of tune when he wrote the anthem you shall now hear.*

There is nothing more wanted now-a-days in the Church Service than a good and authorised Hymnal or Collection of Hymns for congregational use. There

*The choir then sang "If ye love Me," (Tallis,) and "The proud have digged pits for Me," (Tye.)

is no point on which there is a greater diversity of practice. We have spoken of the Old and New Version. These have neither of them strictly legal authority, especially the New Version. The use of these Versions stands only upon an abuse of a permission given by Royal Authority to sing them before and after the regular service.*

There are a great many very objectionable tunes in common use. Many of what are called "Hymn Tunes" belong to well-known songs or glees, such as "Rousseau's Dream;" "Breathe soft, ye Winds;" "Drink to me only with thine Eyes;" "Glorious Apollo;" and even, I have been told, "The British Grenadier," and "The King of the Cannibal Islands." The notorious preacher, Rowland Hill, is said to have defended this practice, on the plea, that "the devil ought not to have the best music to himself." A reverent spirit would have suggested that what was fit for Satan's service was hardly fit for that of our Creator.

Some tunes again don't fit the metre of the words, and these are either cut in two, or repeated, to eke out the melody. There is a tune called the "Bath Chapel" tune, to which the 72nd Psalm is sometimes sung. The first verse is:

> "LORD, let Thy just decrees the King
> In all Thy ways direct;
> And let his Son, throughout his reign,
> Thy righteous laws respect."

This tune renders the verse thus:

> "LORD, let Thy just decrees, the King
> In all Thy ways direct;
> And let his Son, through-
> And let his Son, through-
> And let his Son, through-out his reign,
> Thy righteous laws respect."

This manner of bisecting the words has often an irreverent, not to say ludicrous effect, of which many instances might be given.

*[The 'New Version' is used in America by action of the General Convention, equivalent in authority to a Canon.]

When our Reformers translated the old Service Books of the Church of England, which were written in Latin, and compiled our present Common Prayer Book, there was one part which they did not translate, and that was the Hymns. They wished to do so, but they found it was not so easy a task to translate verse as prose into the "tongue understanded of the people." Archbishop Cranmer desired, that as his English verses "wanted the grace and faculty which he could wish they had," the "King would cause some other to do them into more pleasant English phrase."

But as years went on this wish was not realised. Men put the psalms into verse, and sang them by way of hymns, forgetting that the psalms are most properly chanted.

At last people saw that hymns were wanted. But instead of looking back to the old hymns of the Church of England they wrote new ones; and so a great number of "Collections," that have no authority, came into use.*

However, some earnest and learned men have of late set to work, to carry out the wish of the English Reformers in this matter. They have translated the old hymns of the English Church; and they have also given them the old tunes, which was also the wish of the Reformers.

These hymns were not written at any one time, nor by any one man. They were not written *to order*, but are voluntary offerings cast into the treasury of the Church, slowly, and at different periods, during the space of a thousand years. The writers of most of them are unknown. Of those whom we do know, some are among the greatest saints that God has raised up in His Church.

The melodies are found in the earliest ritual books of the whole Western Churches, and are very probably coeval with the hymns themselves. These are taken principally from the ancient records of the English use now extant in the British Museum. The harmonies are

*[The "Hymns united to the Feasts and Fasts of the Church, and other occasions of Public Worship" are used in America by the same authority as the 'New Version of Psalms.']

composed on the model of the great harmonists of the best periods of Church music. From some of these tunes are taken the subjects of some of the finest compositions of the great masters. Some modern hymn tunes are also mere compositions, or adaptations from them. These tunes are admirably adapted for congregational use. Some of them are remarkably simple in their construction, consisting only of very few notes, almost like a chant.

Such is the first hymn you shall hear, an ancient morning hymn for an early service. This hymn is certainly of the seventh or eighth century, for it is spoken of by Amalarius, a writer of the ninth century, 1000 years ago, as well known in his day.

The next is the only one of the ancient hymns that our Reformers did translate into our Prayer Book. The 'Veni Creator'—'Come, Holy Ghost'—it occurs in the Ordination Service.

This hymn has been generally ascribed to the Emperor Charlemagne, and with every appearance of probability. Charlemagne was as distinguished for his literary attainments as for his military achievements. He was also an ardent lover of the song of the Church. He had for his instructor a celebrated Englishman, Alcuin, who was also the most learned musical scholar of his time. It is just possible, therefore, that the royal composer may have received some *little* assistance from his accomplished tutor. We know that such things *have* happened,—and therefore this hymn *may* be a composition of an Englishman eleven hundred years ago. It has also been attributed to another Englishman, Stephen Langton, the celebrated Archbishop of Canterbury in King John's reign,—this is on the authority of an alleged contemporary writer cited by the editors of the Spicilegium Solesmense. This hymn is from the Salisbury hymnal.

You will observe one peculiarity of these hymns,—they want what *you* call *time*. This is not quite correct,

for if it were so, no two persons could sing them together. They may want ordinary time, but they *have* a time of their own. They have not what is called double or triple time throughout the strain, so that you would find some difficulty in dividing them into bars; they *can* be put into bars, but they would encumber the staff and cramp the free dignified *roll* of the melody. Bars in single parts are an introduction of the last century—quite a new fangled innovation.

The third hymn is a part of a celebrated hymn for the festivals of the Apostles by S. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan in the fourth century, fifteen hundred years ago. This is from the York Hymnal. The melody of this hymn was taken by the great Palestrina, three hundred years ago, as the subject, or theme, of one of his finest masses.*

The last kind of music to be brought before you this evening are some old carols. Carols were popular songs of the Middle Ages, half hymn, half ballad,—they can therefore hardly be called strictly Church music, although they have a strong religious tone and sentiment. Those that you will hear are some ancient Swedish carols, arranged by Messrs. Helmore and Neale, and published by Novello.

I will now then, before these are sung, conclude my long lecture on Church music with two observations.

1. The Roman poet, Horace, tells one of his friends who seems to have thought much of the march of intellect in his day, that "there *were* brave men in the world even before Agamemnon." And in like manner, I confess, I am not one of those who think that there was *nothing good*,—that every thing was wicked in the Church before the Reformation. I scruple not to declare myself so deeply imbued with prejudice, bigotry, and superstition, that I should delight to worship and

* The choir here sang three hymns, from the 'Hymnal Noted;' viz., 'Now that the daylight;' 'Come, Holy Ghost;' and 'The Eternal gifts of Christ the King.' [Novello, New York, sells the 'Hymnal Noted.']

praise Almighty God, as with the same Psalms, so also with the Psalms sung to the same hallowed tunes on which they have been sent up to the throne of grace from the days of old. I plead for choral service, the usage of the Catholic Church both East and West, ever since the formation of Liturgies,—certainly for fifteen hundred years. I plead for the old music, not because it *is* old, (though that would be no proof of worthlessness) but because it far surpasses in majesty, grandeur, simplicity, devotion, solemnity, and utility, the flashy trashiness and the sentimental mawkishness of much of the modern compositions. I plead especially the usage of the Church of England both before and since the Reformation. I would have all the people "open their lips," and cry unto the Lord "with heart, and soul, and voice." I would have them "lift up" their voices, and with "one mind and one mouth,"—not with a cold subdued muttering, or confused Babel-like murmuring, —but "with *one accord*," and "with the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings," as did the Christians of old, and as the blessed hosts of heaven now do, offer up their homage and praise to the glory of God's Most Holy Name.

2. The other observation is this. Why not, as Dr. Cummings says, if we are to have music in our Churches, —why not have the best? The man after God's own heart was not satisfied with exclaiming, "My *heart* is fixed, O God, my *heart* is fixed," but he determined, and he carried out his determination, to "sing and give praise" with "the best member that he had."

People tolerate, as solemn addresses to God in His Holy Temple, noises that they would not tolerate in their own houses, nor, could they help it, in the streets. We are all aware of the trouble taken to get good music in private houses, both in the higher and middle classes. And yet such people are often fond of ridiculing or finding fault with the music they hear at Church. If

they know so much, and care so much about it, why don't they come and try to help and make it better? If they can *find* the fault, why not try to *mend* it? Great people grudge not their hundreds for their London opera boxes, and their fifties for a song from some foreign Signora, but give unwillingly their guinea at Christmas for their village choirs.

It was not so in former days. Nobles and princes of olden times thought themselves honoured by assisting in the song of the Church. Sir Thomas More, while Lord High Chancellor of England, used habitually to put on a surplice, and sing with the choir in the parish Church of Chelsea. The Earl of Northumberland, about the same time maintained a dean and sub-dean of his private chapel, with eighteen choristers, men and boys. A Duke of Chandos, not a hundred and fifty years ago, had the Services in his private Chapel performed in a style superior to that of many Cathedrals. His Organist was a man some of you may have heard of,—his name was *Handel*.

It is a singular fact, that much as we talk of *Old* England, and glory in our adherence to "primitive Christianity," and "the principles of the Reformation," there is, as far as our knowledge extends, no national Church, or sect, that has so thoroughly changed its music within the last two hundred years as has the English Church. I know not how much the Roman Church has retained of the ancient Church-song, but I understand that she is recovering the ground which had been usurped by the theatrical music of the last age. It is not amongst the Protestant Dissenting Communities that we should look for the Old Church music; but it is a suggestive fact that chanting, and what is called Cathedral music, has been introduced into many of their congregations, together with organs, those "boxes of whistles," as their forefathers called them, and which they regarded as among the greatest abominations of Popery. The French Protestants con-

tinue to sing their metrical psalms to the tunes to which they were first set three hundred years ago, without even modernising the notation. The same is in a great measure true of the hymns in use among the German Protestants. English musicians alone who *had* the finest school of Church music in Christendom, not content with the opportunities which anthems and services afford them, have divorced the psalms from the venerable melodies with which "the Holy Church throughout all the world" had associated them for more than a thousand years.

Lastly, we know the prominent position which music frequently occupies in the education of young persons. And yet the only kind of music in which they seem to take no interest is that which is offered up to GOD in His Church. How many young ladies and gentlemen there are whom GOD has blessed with ears, and lungs, and voices, and who will hammer at their Broadwoods, or squeal on their concertinas, from Monday to Saturday, and pay high fees to music masters and mistresses to teach them Italian love-songs, or silly English ballads, who yet go tip-toeing to Church on a Sunday, scorning even to offer unto GOD "that which doth cost them nothing,"—far too "genteel" to "say" any thing in common with "those horrid charity-children," —far too finished musicians to condescend to sing the Psalms of David.

I should like to know, to what more proper or more beneficial use can musical acquirements be applied than to the Music of the House of the LORD? Seriously speaking, there must be something here radically wrong. It is like saying, "We grudge neither time, nor toil, nor money, when the end in view is our own pleasure or amusement; but we do grudge both time, and toil, and money, when the object to be attained is the exaltation, the praise, and glory of ALMIGHTY GOD."